



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/730,937

12/10/2003

David Bain

B5BAI004.14

6316

7590
DAVID BAIN
1807 N. DANVILLE ST.
ARLINGTON, VA 22201

12/11/2008

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TAN D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3689

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/11/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/730,937	Applicant(s) BAIN, DAVID	
	Examiner Tan Dean D. Nguyen	Art Unit 3689	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3,5-16 and 18-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3,5-16 and 18-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/17/08 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. The amendment filed 9/17/08 has been entered. Claims 3, 5-16, 18-20 are pending. Claims 1-2, 4, and 17 have been canceled. The claims include:

- 1) Method¹ claims: 3, 5-8 and 19,
- 2) Method² claims 9-15 and 20, and
- 3) Method³ claims 16 and 18.

Claims 3, 5-8 and 19 are broadest claims and will be examined first.

As of 9/17/08, independent method claim 3 is as followed:

- 3. (Currently Amended) A method of raising capital comprising:
 - (a) establishing an on-line site for registering and broadcasting a bounty offering; said bounty offering including a reward offered by at least one benefactor, and a condition to be completed in order for a beneficiary to receive the reward;
 - (b) broadcasting said bounty offering on-line to a plurality of actors;

Art Unit: 3689

(c) broadcasting said bounty offering to a plurality of viewers, and wherein said viewers in response to viewing said broadcast contribute money towards the reward to be paid by the benefactor and

(d) paying the reward to the beneficiary upon the completion of the condition by one of the plurality of actors.

Note that the alphabetical letters (a)-(d) are attached to the steps for convenience purpose to avoid typing of the whole phrase.

3. Note:

1) In claim 1, step (a), the phrase “for registering and broadcasting a bounty offering; said bounty offering including a reward offered by at least one benefactor, and a condition to be completed in order for a beneficiary to receive the reward” is not a positively recited method step but, rather, is mere intended use of the established on-line site and thus having no patentable weight. See MPEP 2173.05 (q), 2106, and 2111.04, which indicate that a method claim requires active, positive steps.

2) In steps (c), the phrase “to be paid by the benefactor” is not a positively recited method step but, rather, is mere intended use or function of the reward. The use of passive state such as “to be completed” or “to be paid”, is not positive recitation in a method claim and is considered as “being capable of”.

3) As for the limitation “actors”, they are considered as non-functional descriptive material (NFDM) on the data of “...”, thus having no patentable weight. The mere

Art Unit: 3689

insertion of “price” data over “data” does not “impart functionality when employed as a computer component”, thus having no patentable weight.

See MPEP 2106.01 “Descriptive material can be characterized as either “functional descriptive material” or “nonfunctional descriptive material.” In this context, “functional descriptive material” consists of data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component. (The definition of “data structure” is “a physical or logical relationship among data elements, designed to support specific data manipulation functions.” The New IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms 308 (5th ed. 1993).) “Nonfunctional descriptive material” includes but is not limited to music, literary works, and a compilation or mere arrangement of data.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 3689

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
6. **Claims 3, 5-8, 19 (method¹), 9-10, 14, 15, 20 (method²), 16, 18 (method³) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over (1) KAPLAN in view of (2) COSTIN et al.**

As for independent method¹ claim 3, on Fig. 4B, **KAPLAN** discloses a method of fundraising for charity comprising the steps of:

(a) establishing an on-line site for registering and broadcasting fundraising event, a game of a bounty offering (game or competition with reward) {see [0003, 0051 “*Online Distributed Problem Solving*” (ODPS), 0058, 0059, 0060, Fig. 4A, Fig. 4B} and said bounty offering including a reward offered by at least one benefactor (giver) {[0058 “*how much money the customer is willing to pay*”] and a condition to be completed (solving the problem) in order for a beneficiary to receive the reward {[0060, 0061]};

(b) broadcasting said bounty offering on-line to a plurality of participants (players, expert, who “acts”) {[0051, 0060, 0065], Figs. 1, 4B};

(c.) broadcasting said bounty offering to a plurality of viewers (parties) {[0051, 0065], Figs. 1, 4B};

(d) selecting the beneficiary from the plurality of participants (parties) by determining a first party to complete the condition (solving the problem) {Figs. 1, 4A and 4B, [0060, 0061]}.

As for the limitation “actor” (one who performs a certain action), this reads over the player or expert as taught in [0060, 0061].

Art Unit: 3689

KAPLAN fairly teaches the claimed invention except for the viewers in (c.) contribute money (directly) towards the campaign fund.

On Figs. 3, 8, 12, **COSTIN, IV et al** disclose a method for raising capital (funds) comprising the steps of:

(a) establishing an on-line site for registering and broadcasting a fundraising event, said event including a donation reward offered by at least one benefactor (sponsor);

(b) broadcasting said event on-line to a plurality of participants;

(c) broadcasting said event to a plurality of viewers, and wherein said viewers in response to viewing said broadcast contribute money towards the reward (event result or goal) to be paid by the benefactor and

(d) paying (giving or distributing) the funds or capital (money) to a designated party (charity organization) upon the completion of the condition by one of the plurality of participants (Fig. 8, Y-ME 5k race).

Note on Fig. 1b or 3, COSTIN, IV et al discloses several ways to raise funds for charity by acquiring direct donations from various customers (donors), i.e. (1) fund (capital or money) from the business/sponsor, and (2) fund (capital or money) from the viewer/participant (purchaser, see Fig. 3 “20% of all your next purchase for raising \$1,000”)/user or donor. It would have been obvious to modify the fundraising teachings of KAPLAN by including the teaching of “viewers” contribute money toward the funds (reward) for eventually donating to charity organization directly as taught by COSTIN et al above.

Art Unit: 3689

As for dep. claim 5 (part of 3 above) which deals with the broadcasting parameters, i.e. a plurality of broadcasts simultaneously, since it's well known in the art the practice of "duplicating of services (parts) for multiple effects, see St. Regis Paper Co. vs. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8, 11; 549 F2d 833 (7th Cir. 1977), it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to duplicate the broadcast and carrying them out simultaneously to reach out to more donors or multiple effects. See also COSTIN, IV et al Fig. 8. Moreover, this is also taught in KAPLAN this feature is taught in [0026, 0042 "*simultaneously*"], 0220 "*simultaneously*".

As for dep. claim 6 (part of 3 above) which deals with the benefit to the benefactor for contributing towards the reward, this is taught in COSTIN, IV et al [0002 "*mutual gain ... positive impact on the business*"], and [0005 "*enhance brand reputation, acquire customers, and contribute to charitable well being*".

As for dep. claim 7 (part of 3 above) which deals with online registering parameters, this is fairly taught in COSTIN, IV et al Figs. 2, 6, 8 "Registering", [0009], [0010], and KAPLAN [0061].

As for dep. claims 8, 19 (part of 3 above) which deals with well known fundraising parameters, i.e. updating status of reward, goal, contribution (donation), etc., these are fairly taught in COSTIN, IV et al Figs. 3, 6, 8, 12 and 13. The updating of any features to accurately indicate the campaign status or fundraising campaign parameters would have been obvious to a skilled artisan as mere indicating other fundraising campaign monitoring parameters, absent evidence of unexpected results.

Art Unit: 3689

7. **As for independent method² claim 9**, which has similar limitations as in independent method¹ claim 3 above, it's rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 3 above.

As for dep. claim 10 (part of 9 above), which deals with broadcasting parameters, i.e. broadcasting a plurality of events simultaneously, this feature is taught in [0026, 0042 "*simultaneously*"], 0220 "*simultaneously*"]. Alternatively, the presentation of more than one bounty offering vs. an offering would have been obvious to a skilled artisan as mere duplicate of parts for multiple effects. See *In re* Harza, 124USPQ378, CCPA 1960.

As for dep. claims 11-13 (part of 9 above), which deal with donation or benefactor parameters, i.e. 2nd benefactor paying a competition reward, etc., these are non-essential to the scope of the claimed invention and would have been obvious to do so as mere different ways of providing a reward money while involving more people, thus reducing the amount of giving/person.

As for dep. claim 14 (part of 9 above), which deals with the type of condition or conditioning parameters, i.e. the solving of a problem, this is non-essential to the scope of the claimed invention and is taught in Figs. 1, 4A or 4B or [0024-0025].

As for dep. claim 15 (part of 9 above), which deals with the type of condition or conditioning parameters, i.e. the solving of a problem such as a cure for a disease, this is non-essential to the scope of the claimed invention and is taught in Figs. 1, 4A or 4B or [0024, 0025].

Art Unit: 3689

As for dep. claim 20 (part of 9 above), which has the same limitation as in dep. claim 19 (part of 3 above), it's rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of dep. claim 19 above.

8. **As for independent method³ claim 16**, which is basically the combination of claims 3 and 4 above, it's rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 3 and 4 above. See also, KAPLAN Fig. 4B, top paragraph, wherein the total reward of \$500.00 has been given to charity "*total charitable donation amount of \$500.00 has been split among several questions*".

As for dep. claim 18 (part of 16 above), which has the same limitation as in dep. claim 19 (part of 3 above), it's rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of dep. claim 19 above.

9. **Claims 3, 5-8, 19 (method¹), 9-10, 14, 15, 20 (method²), 16, 18 (method³) are rejected (2nd time) under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over (1) KAPLAN in view of (2) COSTIN et al and (3a) FIDLER or (3b) BT SWIMATHON '99.**

As of 9/7/06, claim 3 is as followed:

3. (Currently Amended) A method of raising capital comprising:

(a) establishing an on-line site for registering and broadcasting a bounty offering; said bounty offering including a reward offered by at least one benefactor, and a condition to be completed in order for a beneficiary to receive the reward;

(b) broadcasting said bounty offering on-line to a plurality of actors;

Art Unit: 3689

(c) broadcasting said bounty offering to a plurality of viewers, and wherein said viewers in response to viewing said broadcast contribute money towards the reward to be paid by the benefactor and

(d) paying the reward to a designated party upon the completion of the condition by one of the plurality of actors.

Note that the alphabetical letters (a)-(d) are attached to the steps for convenience purpose to avoid typing of the whole phrase.

As for independent method¹ claim 3, on Fig. 4B, **KAPLAN** discloses a method of fundraising for charity comprising the steps of:

(a) establishing an on-line site for registering and broadcasting fundraising event, a game of a bounty offering (game or competition with reward) {see [0003, 0051 “*Online Distributed Problem Solving*” (ODPS), 0058, 0059, 0060, Fig. 4A, Fig. 4B} and said bounty offering including a reward offered by at least one benefactor (giver) {[0058 “*how much money the customer is willing to pay*”] and a condition to be completed (solving the problem) in order for a beneficiary to receive the reward {[0060, 0061}};

(b) broadcasting said bounty offering on-line to a plurality of participants (players) {[0051, 0065], Figs. 1, 4B}};

(c.) broadcasting said bounty offering to a plurality of viewers (parties) {[0051, 0065], Figs. 1, 4B}};

(d) selecting the beneficiary from the plurality of participants (parties) by determining a first party to complete the condition (solving the problem) {Figs. 1, 4A and 4B, [0060, 0061}}.

Art Unit: 3689

KAPLAN fairly teaches the claimed invention except for explicitly disclose that the participants (contestants) in (b) are actors (or celebrities) and the viewers in (c.) contribute money (directly) towards the campaign fund.

On Figs. 3, 8, 12, **COSTIN, IV et al** disclose a method for raising capital (funds) comprising the steps of:

(a) establishing an on-line site for registering and broadcasting a fundraising event, said event including a donation reward offered by at least one benefactor (sponsor);

(b) broadcasting said event on-line to a plurality of participants;

(c) broadcasting said event to a plurality of viewers, and wherein said viewers in response to viewing said broadcast contribute money towards the reward (event result or goal) to be paid by the benefactor and

(d) paying (giving or distributing) the funds or capital (money) to a designated party (charity organization) upon the completion of the condition by one of the plurality of participants (Fig. 8, Y-ME 5k race).

Note on Fig. 1b or 3, COSTIN, IV et al discloses several ways to raise funds for charity by acquiring direct donations from various customers (donors), i.e. (1) fund (capital or money) from the business/sponsor, and (2) fund (capital or money) from the viewer/participant (purchaser, see Fig. 3 “20% of all your next purchase for raising \$1,000”)/user or donor. It would have been obvious to modify the fundraising teachings of KAPLAN by including the teaching of “viewers” contribute money

Art Unit: 3689

toward the funds (reward) for eventually donating to charity organization directly as taught by COSTIN et al above.

In another fundraising campaign for charity organization, FIDLER is cited to teach the use of celebrity as contestants and the prize money or prized of the contest is directed to charitable purpose or organization such as American Red Cross [0088].

The celebrity normally has a great influence, attracting a lot of attention and drawing a crowd or follower which could lead to increase participation in the fundraising campaign. It would have been obvious to modify the teachings of KAPLAN /COSTIN et al to include the actors for the purpose of increase participation because the celebrity normally has a great influence, attracting a lot of attention and drawing a crowd or follower which could lead to increase participation in the fundraising campaign as taught by FIDLER.

In another fundraising campaign for charity organization, BT SWIMATHON '99 is cited to teach the use of celebrities (i.e. model Sheryl Gascoigne, TV presenter Anna Walker, MBE, Gladiators Hunter and Rhino, etc.) as contestants and the prize money or prized of the contest is directed to charitable purpose or organization such as NSPCC and other national charities, see page 1. The celebrity normally has a great influence, attracting a lot of attention and drawing a crowd or follower which could lead to increase participation in the fundraising campaign.

It would have been obvious to modify the teachings of KAPLAN by including features on the online website for viewers to donate (contribute money) toward the campaign fund as taught by COSTIN, IV et al above and selecting celebrities as contestant as

Art Unit: 3689

taught by BT SWIMATHON '99 since they normally have great influence, attracting a lot of attention and drawing a crowd or follower which could lead to increase participation in the fundraising campaign.

As for dep. claim 5 (part of 3 above) which deals with the broadcasting parameters, i.e. a plurality of broadcasts simultaneously, since it's well known in the art the practice of "duplicating of services (parts) for multiple effects, see St. Regis Paper Co. vs. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8, 11; 549 F2d 833 (7th Cir. 1977), it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to duplicate the broadcast and carrying them out simultaneously to reach out to more donors or multiple effects. See also COSTIN, IV et al Fig. 8. Moreover, this is also taught in KAPLAN this feature is taught in [0026, 0042 "*simultaneously*"], 0220 "*simultaneously*").

As for dep. claim 6 (part of 3 above) which deals with the benefit to the benefactor for contributing towards the reward, this is taught in COSTIN, IV et al [0002 "*mutual gain ... positive impact on the business*"], and [0005 "*enhance brand reputation, acquire customers, and contribute to charitable well being*").

As for dep. claim 7 (part of 3 above) which deals with online registering parameters, this is fairly taught in COSTIN, IV et al Figs. 2, 6, 8 "Registering", [0009], [0010], and KAPLAN [0061].

As for dep. claims 8, 19 (part of 3 above) which deals with well known fundraising parameters, i.e. updating status of reward, goal, contribution (donation), etc., these are fairly taught in COSTIN, IV et al Figs. 3, 6, 8, 12 and 13. The updating of any

Art Unit: 3689

features to accurately indicate the campaign status or fundraising campaign parameters would have been obvious to a skilled artisan as mere indicating other fundraising campaign monitoring parameters, absent evidence of unexpected results.

10. **As for independent method² claim 9**, which has similar limitations as in independent method¹ claim 3 above, it's rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 3 above.

As for dep. claim 10 (part of 9 above), which deals with broadcasting parameters, i.e. broadcasting a plurality of events simultaneously, this feature is taught in [0026, 0042 "*simultaneously*"], 0220 "*simultaneously*"]. Alternatively, the presentation of more than one bounty offering vs. an offering would have been obvious to a skilled artisan as mere duplicate of parts for multiple effects. See *In re* Harza, 124USPQ378, CCPA 1960.

As for dep. claims 11-13 (part of 9 above), which deal with donation or benefactor parameters, i.e. 2nd benefactor paying a competition reward, etc., these are non-essential to the scope of the claimed invention and would have been obvious to do so as mere different ways of providing a reward money while involving more people, thus reducing the amount of giving/person.

As for dep. claim 14 (part of 9 above), which deals with the type of condition or conditioning parameters, i.e. the solving of a problem, this is non-essential to the scope of the claimed invention and is taught in Figs. 1, 4A or 4B or [0024-0025].

Art Unit: 3689

As for dep. claim 15 (part of 9 above), which deals with the type of condition or conditioning parameters, i.e. the solving of a problem such as a cure for a disease, this is non-essential to the scope of the claimed invention and is taught in Figs. 1, 4A or 4B or [0024, 0025].

As for dep. claim 20 (part of 9 above), which has the same limitation as in dep. claim 19 (part of 3 above), it's rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of dep. claim 19 above.

11. **As for independent method³ claim 16**, which is basically the combination of claims 3 and 4 above, it's rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 3 and 4 above. See also, KAPLAN Fig. 4B, top paragraph, wherein the total reward of \$500.00 has been given to charity "*total charitable donation amount of \$500.00 has been split among several questions*".

As for dep. claim 18 (part of 16 above), which has the same limitation as in dep. claim 19 (part of 3 above), it's rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of dep. claim 19 above.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 9/17/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive in view of the new claim interpretations as shown on paragraph no. 3 above.

Art Unit: 3689

Most of applicant's arguments on pages 10-12 appear to fall in the area of steps (a) and (c) which do not appear to receive much patentable weight for the claim interpretation as shown by the examiner on par. no. 3 above.

13. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Applicant's main argument that KAPLAN deals with competition between potential parties to have problem solved and does not teach about donation or fundraising is not persuasive in view of Fig. 2, (d), Fig. 4A "...**donate to charity for posts related to that topics...**", [0061 ... **donating money to charity,.....using charity to motivate users....**"].

14. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, COSTIN et al with KAPLAN, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, both deal with fundraising campaign and It would have been obvious to modify the fundraising teachings of KAPLAN by including the teaching of "viewers" contribute

Art Unit: 3689

money toward the funds (reward) for eventually donating to charity organization directly as taught by COSTIN et al above.

No claims are allowed.

Art Unit: 3689

15. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct@uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

In receiving an Office Action, it becomes apparent that certain documents are missing, e. g. copies of references, Forms PTO 1449, PTO-892, etc., requests for copies should be directed to Tech Center 3600 Customer Service at (571) 272-3600, or e-mail CustomerService3600@uspto.gov.

Any inquiry concerning the merits of the examination of the application should be directed to Dean Tan Nguyen at telephone number (571) 272-6806. My work schedule is normally Monday through Friday from 6:30 am - 4:00 pm. I am scheduled to be off every other Friday. Should I be unavailable during my normal working hours, my supervisor Janice Mooneyham can be reached at (571) 272-6805. The main FAX phone numbers for formal communications concerning this application are **(571) 273-8300**. My personal Fax is (571) 273-6806. Informal communications may be made, following a telephone call to the examiner, by an informal FAX number to be given.

/Tan Dean D. Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3689